

## REMARKS

Claims 1 through 16 are pending in the present application. Applicants propose adding claim 17.

Claims 1 through 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### *Interview Summary*

Applicants thank Examiner Niquette for granting the telephonic interview of August 12, 2009. During that interview, the undersigned discussed claim 1 and suggested distinctions between the claim and the cited references. Examiner Niquette agreed to give further consideration to the distinctions upon receipt of a written submission.

### *Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 1 through 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being rendered obvious over U.S. patent number 7,418,418 (hereinafter "Wizon") in view of U.S. patent number 7,467,108 (hereinafter "Papka"). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants have noted that:

[f]inancial products, and in particular derivative products, are subject to very strict regulation that requires financial establishments and commercial enterprises using them to price them as a function of a certain number of hypotheses, involving variables arising from the characteristics of the products in question and variables arising from the financial markets to which these products belong. These prices must be calculated for the purposes of valuation and also so that they can be incorporated into the required Financial Risk reports, in particular the VaR (Value at Risk). These "pricing" calculations must be updated very frequently--usually daily--which involves very cumbersome data processing.

In addition, many new financial products appear regularly. The analysis of each new product in order to calculate the price, the VaR, etc., is very cumbersome work, and most often requires

developing a specific pricing model. This model is then integrated into the information processing systems used for the examination, processing, valuation, and calculation of risks. These systems are often different. (Specification at p.1, ¶ 2, 3).

Applicant has disclosed systems and methods for pricing financial products. Amended claim 1 recites:

A financial product pricing system, comprising:  
**a computer interface for receiving** into the system data that identify and describe the product, the data comprising: contextual data of the product, the contextual data indicating market variables involved in product pricing and used for selecting a market hypothesis for pricing the product, the contextual data comprising at least one valuation currency and at least one underlying instrument; and **characteristic data of the product comprising a set of at least one of future financial events or financial flows associated with the product;**  
**a data processor adapted for:**  
**generating a planned schedule from the data that identify and describe the product, the planned schedule comprising for each of a plurality of future dates at least one of a financial event or financial flow relating to the product;**  
**interpreting the schedule, in order to generate: a table of variables for the product on the basis of at least one of the financial events or financial flows, and for each future date of the planned schedule, a function for calculating the product price as a function of at least one of the product variables;**  
**receiving a list of market variables associated with the product and generated by a market analysis, the market variables identified for each of the plurality of future dates used in pricing the product; and**  
**calculating using the market variables, for each of a plurality of market scenarios and for each of the plurality of future dates on the schedule, product variable values; and**  
**calculating a product price as a function of the calculated product variable values.**

In order for a set of references to render claim 1 obvious, the references must disclose each and every element of the recited claim and disclose arranging the recited elements to form the recited

combination. Applicant respectfully submits that Wizon and Papka do not disclose or suggest at least the above-emphasized claim language and therefore cannot possibly teach the recited combination.

Wizon discloses a computer-based system for pricing fixed income securities. In the system disclosed by Wizon, users select a portfolio of fixed income securities from a portfolio database and then select a pricing method for pricing one of the fixed income securities in the selected portfolio. (Abstract). Wizon discloses calculating the price of the selected fixed income security based upon the designated pricing method. (Abstract).

Thus, in Wizon, a user selects a pricing model for a selected fixed income security and the system calculates the price. But, the Office acknowledges that Wizon does not disclose or suggest:

generating a planned schedule from the data that identify and describe the product, the planned schedule comprising for each of a plurality of future dates at least one of a financial event or financial flow relating to the product; interpreting the schedule, in order to generate: a table of variables for the product on the basis of at least one of the financial events or financial flows, and for each future date of the planned schedule, a function for calculating the product price as a function of at least one of the product variables;

Applicant further notes that if Wizon does not disclose the above claim language, it cannot possibly disclose:

receiving a list of market variables associated with the product and generated by a market analysis, the market variables identified for each of the plurality of future dates used in pricing the product; and calculating using the market variables, for each of a plurality of market scenarios and for each of the plurality of future dates on the schedule, product variable values.

The Office relies on Papka as allegedly addressing the deficiencies of Wizon. Applicant respectfully disagree.

Papka discloses a method of creating a price prediction model that forecasts short-term price fluctuations in financial instruments by collecting, analyzing and classifying financial news for a financial instrument into categories. (Abstract). According to Papka, financial analysts review textual financial documents obtained from public interest web sites and classify the documents to be either "good news" or "bad news" relative to the expected performance of a financial instrument. (Col. 2, ll. 32-45). Distributions of **historical** price changes for a particular financial instrument are sampled from the data based on the occurrences of the different classifications of news. (Col. 2, ll. 32-45) (Col. 3, ll. 60-62). The distributions are used to form a model that produces **buy, sell, and no-trade signals** for the financial instrument. (Col. 2, ll. 32-45) (Col. 3, ln. 60 – Col. 5, ln. 35). The model is then used to predict when to buy, sell or not trade the stock given the daily occurrences of the underlying company's financial news. (Col. 2, ll. 32-45) (Col. 5, ll. 35-55).

Thus, Papka discloses a method wherein classifications of **past** news stories are correlated with the corresponding **historical** price values for a stock to create a model for whether a stock value will fall or rise in response to a particular type of news story. In contrast with claim 1, Papka does not disclose or suggest "**generating a planned schedule from the data that identify and describe the product, the planned schedule comprising for each of a plurality of future dates at least one of a financial event or financial flow relating to the product.**" Rather, Papka discloses using **past** new articles to generate a price prediction model. But past news articles are not a "**planned schedule**." Furthermore, past news articles are not "**a planned schedule from the data that identify and describe the product.**" Still further, past news articles are not a "**planned schedule comprising for each of a plurality of future dates at least one of an event or flow relating to the product.**" Applicants respectfully request that should the Office maintain the rejection, that it quote the specific language from Papka that is alleged to correspond to the above-noted language.

Likewise, Papka does not disclose **interpreting the schedule, in order to generate: a table of variables for the product on the basis of at least one of the financial events or financial flows, and for each future date of the planned schedule, a function for calculating**

**the product price as a function of at least one of the product variables.**" As noted above, Papka does not disclose "generating a planned schedule." Therefore, Papka cannot possibly disclose "interpreting the schedule." Furthermore, Papka does not disclose or suggest "generat[ing] . . . a table of variables for the product." Indeed, Papka nowhere even uses the word "table." Still further, Papka does not disclose or suggest "**generat[ing] . . . for each future date of a planned schedule, a function for calculating the product price as a function of at least one of the product variables.**" Rather, Papka discloses generating a price prediction model that produces a buy, sell, and no-trade signal. But the model disclosed by Papka is not "for each date of a planned schedule." Furthermore, the model disclosed by Papka does not generate "a function for calculating **the product price.**" Rather, Papka discloses a model for generating a "buy, sell, and no-trade signal[]'" (Col. 5, ll. 24-25).

Applicant further notes that if Papka does not disclose the above claim language, it cannot possibly disclose:

**receiving a list of market variables associated with the product and generated by a market analysis, the market variables identified for each of the plurality of future dates used in pricing the product; and**

**calculating using the market variables, for each of a plurality of market scenarios and for each of the plurality of future dates on the schedule, product variable values.**

Therefore, because neither Wizon nor Papka disclose or suggest at least the above-emphasized claim language, it cannot possibly disclose or suggest the combination recited in claim 1. Accordingly claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are not rendered obvious. Although the language of claims 9 and 17 is different from that of claim 1, for reasons similar to those discussed above, claims 9 and 17 are not rendered obvious.

Applicants note that claim 17 further distinguishes from the cited references for additional reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose or suggest at least the following additional language:

**displaying a first user interface on the computing system, the first user interface adapted to receive data that**

**identify and describe the product, the data comprising:**  
contextual data of the product, the contextual data indicating  
market variables involved in product pricing and used for selecting  
a market hypothesis for pricing the product, the contextual data  
comprising at least one valuation currency and at least one  
underlying instrument; and characteristic data of the product  
comprising a set of at least one of future financial events or  
financial flows associated with the product;

**receiving at the computing system via the first user**  
**interface contextual data of the product and characteristic data**  
**of the product, the characteristic data comprising at least one**  
**numerical equation that is employed in determining a future**  
**value of a financial flow;**

**displaying a second user interface on the computing**  
**system, the second user interface comprising a listing of dates**  
**and for each date a product flow defined using at least in part**  
**the at least one numerical equation;**

For this additional reason, claim 17 defines over the cited references.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: SDS-0119  
Application No.: 10/537,650  
Office Action: February 27, 2009 - Advisory: June 27, 2009

PATENT

***Conclusion***

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested.

If the Examiner should have any questions regarding this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (215) 568-3100.

Date: August 26, 2009

/John E. McGlynn/  
John E. McGlynn  
Registration No. 42,863

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439